

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 15 remain pending in this Application. Claims 1, 14, and 15 have each been currently amended.

5

Applicants note that the drawings filed on November 1, 2002, have been accepted.

“Claims 1-2, 4-7, 10 and 12-15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Leppisaari et al. US 2002/0101517.” Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 14, and 15 to more clearly highlight the patentable differences between the present invention as claimed, and that taught by Leppisaari et al.

Claim 1, as currently amended, reads as follows:

A method for automatically framing and tracking an object of interest using a camera associated with a hand-held processing device, the method comprising the steps of:

continuously detecting relative movement between the hand-held device and the object of interest within a displayed image generated by said camera; and

continuously adjusting at least one setting of the camera in response to the detected relative movement, so as to maintain a desired framing and tracking of the object of interest within an image and/or successive images generated by the camera for selectively providing either one of a still picture of the object or video image of the object, respectively.

Leppisaari et al. does not teach or even suggest the detection of relative movement between a camera incorporated in a hand-held device and an object of interest, in order to adjust a setting of the camera in response to the detected relative movement, as claimed in Claim 1 (currently amended). More specifically Leppisaari et al. operates to focus on an object based upon a comparison of prerecorded features of

the object with the object image presently obtained by a camera. The comparison is made using pattern recognition, and based upon the results of the pattern of recognition, focusing of the camera is accomplished. Only a fixed image from a present image field as identified by the prerecorded image is transmitted. Leppisaari et al. does not teach continuously tracking and continuously adjusting via detection of relative movement between a hand-held device and an object or target of interest, as claimed by Applicants. Applicants urge that the teachings of Leppisaari et al. actually teach away from Applicants' invention as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants urge that the method of Claim 1 (currently amended) is clearly patentable over the teachings of Leppisaari et al.

Claims 2 through 13 are each ultimately dependent from Claim 1 (currently amended). Accordingly, these dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1 (currently amended).

Claim 14 as currently amended reads as follows:

An apparatus for automatically tracking an object of interest, the apparatus comprising:

a hand-held processing device having at least one camera associated therewith, the hand-held device further comprising a processor operative to continuously monitor the detection of relative movement between the hand-held device and the object of interest, said processor being responsive to the detected relative movement for adjusting at least one setting of the camera so as to continuously maintain a desired framing of the object of interest within an image generated by the camera.

From comments made above relative to the teachings of Leppisaari et al., it is clear that this reference does not anticipate or make obvious the apparatus of Claim 14 (currently amended), calling for from amongst other elements "...said processor being responsive to the detected relative movement for adjusting at least one setting of the camera so as to continuously maintain a desired framing of the object of interest within an image generated by the camera." Nor does Leppisaari et al. suggest the element of

having “. . .a processor operative to continuously monitor the detection of relative movement between the hand-held device and the object of interest . . .” Accordingly, Claim 14 as currently amended is not anticipated or made obvious by the teachings of Leppisaari et al.

5

Claim 15 as currently amended reads as follows:

An article of manufacture comprising a storage medium for storing one or more programs for tracking an object of interest using at least one camera associated with a hand-held processing device, wherein the one or more programs when executed by a processor implement the steps of:

10

detecting relative movement between the hand-held device and the object of interest; and

15

adjusting at least one setting of the camera, in response to the detected relative movement, so as to maintain a desired framing of the object of interest within an image generated by the camera.

20

As previously indicated, Leppisaari et al. does not teach or even suggest the “detecting” and “adjusting” steps of Claim 15 (currently amended). Accordingly, Claim 15 (currently amended) is not anticipated or made obvious by the teachings of Leppisaari et al., and as such is patentable.

25

“Claim 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leppisaari et al.” as indicated above, Claim 9 is dependent from Claim 1, and as such is patentable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1 (currently amended).

30

“Claim 3 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leppisaari et al. as applied to Claim 1 above and further in view of Yuyama et al. US 5,612,732.” As indicated above, Claim 3 is dependent from Claim 1, and as such is patentable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1 (currently amended).

"Claim 8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leppisaari et al. as applied to Claim 1 above and further in view of Yerazunis et al. US 6,600,657." Further as indicated above, Claim 8 is dependent from Claim 1, and as such is patentable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1 (currently amended).

5

"Claim 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leppisaari et al. as applied to Claims 1 and 10 above and further in view of Van Den Herik US 6,253,032." As indicated above, Claim 11 is dependent from Claim 10, which is dependent from Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 11 is patentable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1 (currently amended).

10

Applicants have shown that the claims as now presented are not anticipated or made obvious by the teachings of the cited references, whether taken individually or in any combination. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the claims be allowed, and the case passed to issue.

15

Respectfully submitted,



20

Kenneth Watov, Esquire  
Registration No. 26,042  
Attorney for Applicants

25

Address All Correspondence to:  
Gregory L. Thorne, Esq.  
Senior Intellectual Property Counsel  
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards  
345 Scarborough Road  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
(914) 945-6000

30

050504 12311013.AMD